

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 93 04:30:08 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #380
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 18 Oct 93 Volume 93 : Issue 380

Today's Topics:

 End-It All Now, Please ... (6 msgs)
 Getting my license. Do I want to be like this? (2 msgs)
 HF and MF access w/o the code (2 msgs)
 Mods to Part 97? (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 17 Oct 1993 18:47:39 GMT
From: world!rbarnaby@uunet.uu.net
Subject: End-It All Now, Please...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

edellers@news.delphi.com (EDELLERS@DELPHI.COM) writes:

>"...these no-clue whiners..."

>Do you actually have a RATIONAL argument for requiring CW skills?

Yup. Personal experience. Here goes...

About 1970 I was driving an Van full of supplies from Boston to St. Johnsbury VT. Wx was very cold about -25 Deg F. I was low on gas, and coming into Canon Mountain area on RTE 3 heading north, decided to let the rig coast to save gas during a long decent. Near the bottom, I tried starting the van by placing back in gear, but it wouldn't start. I tried to restart the engine but the alternator must have been bad. Battery was very low, (you know when you turn the key and the lights dim to about zero).

I coasted to the side, shut off all lights and got my 2 meter tranceiver on the air for a Distress Call. No response. Battery was getting weaker by repeated calls. I'm in a valley far away from humans, its 25 below, I have no heat, its 3:00 in the AM and I havent seen a single car in either direction since starting on RTE 3 N.

Finally, a ham in Worcester MA picked the distress signal (Iwas hitting his repeater very weakly) and couldn't make out anything except a scattered word here and there. I could hear him OK. He asked me to conserve power by just answering his questions with a press of the PTT for yes or 2 presses for no. Finally he asked for the number of a friend who might be near enough to drive. I used *CW* which we both knew to achieve that by making-breaking the carrier of the almost-out-of-power-rig.

Did it save my life? I can't say for sure what might have happened. But I can say that when my friend showed up 50 minutes later I was pretty darn cold.

I'm thankful of the discipline, and the fun of CW, and its practical aspects as well.

Richard L. Barnaby rbarnaby@world.std.com (ex K10LZ) pending AA1??

Date: 17 Oct 93 23:09:05 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: End-It All Now, Please ...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I don't understand why EVERYONE is fighting over this no-code under 30 Mhz. THERE IS NOW NO CODE OPERATIONS BELOW 30 MHZ! AND YOU DON'T NEED A LICENSE OF ANY KIND! You can run as MUCH POWER AS YOU WANT, USE ANY LANGUAGE YOU WANT, (foul too!) 95% of all HF rigs operate there NOW.

Where is this panacea at you ask?

Bewteen 26.9 to 27.4 (or thereabouts. no one worries abt band limits there)

If you DON'T WANT TO LEGALLY CHANGE THE RULES, OR JUST LIKE TO COMPLAIN, THEN this "band" awaits. It seems (or at least the most vocal ones) to have come from that region to start with.

With that said, LET THIS THREAD DIE and move on to the REAL issues of HAM-POLICY. The FCC's hands are tied until the next WARC, and they have said, there will be no MORE operating authority below 30 Mhz for non-coded Tecs.

Date: 17 Oct 1993 21:03:38 -0400

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!news.delphi.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: End-It All Now, Please ...

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

WB4WOR@steffi.uncg.EDU (CHARLES LAYNO (WB4WOR)) writes:

>If you DON'T WANT TO LEGALLY CHANGE THE RULES, OR JUST LIKE TO COMPLAIN, THEN
>this "band" awaits. It seems (or at least the most vocal ones) to have come
>from that region to start with.

>With that said, LET THIS THREAD DIE and move on to the REAL issues of
>HAM-POLICY. The FCC's hands are tied until the next WARC, and they have said,
>there will be no MORE operating authority below 30 Mhz for non-coded Tecs.

I *do* most certainly want to get the rules changed legally. It's not a
matter of "liking to complain."

This IS a real issue of amateur radio policy.

The FCC's hands are NOT tied until the next WARC. We can opt out by
notification, as Japan did.

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 1993 06:45:55 GMT

From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa

Subject: End-It All Now, Please ...

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <29sq1a\$hvd@news.delphi.com> edellers@news.delphi.com
(EDELLERS@DELPHI.COM) writes:

>WB4WOR@steffi.uncg.EDU (CHARLES LAYNO (WB4WOR)) writes:

>

>>If you DON'T WANT TO LEGALLY CHANGE THE RULES, OR JUST LIKE TO COMPLAIN, THEN
>>this "band" awaits. It seems (or at least the most vocal ones) to have come
>>from that region to start with.

>

>>With that said, LET THIS THREAD DIE and move on to the REAL issues of
>>HAM-POLICY. The FCC's hands are tied until the next WARC, and they have said,
>>there will be no MORE operating authority below 30 Mhz for non-coded Tecs.

>

>I *do* most certainly want to get the rules changed legally. It's not a
>matter of "liking to complain."

>

>This IS a real issue of amateur radio policy.

>

>The FCC's hands are NOT tied until the next WARC. We can opt out by
>notification, as Japan did.

Gee, you keep mentioning Japan without mentioning the severe power
restrictions imposed on the no-code licensees.

Again, if you want to operate below 30 MHz with learning the code feel
free to use 11 or 1650 meters.

Now, what about those dang antenna restrictions in community housing;
that's what we SHOULD be discussing!

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 93 02:13:01 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!
menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: End-It All Now, Please...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

edellers@news.delphi.com (EDELLERS@DELPHI.COM) writes:

> You still haven't cited a valid reason for REQUIRING Morse Code.

Really? Darn! I thought International Treaty was a pretty valid one.
I really don't see what all the complaining is about. We already HAVE
a no-code license: the Technician. Why don't you give ME a valid reason
why this is neither adequate nor acceptable to you?

--Robert

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 93 02:11:41 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!
menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: End-It All Now, Please ...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

WB4WOR@steffi.uncg.EDU (CHARLES LAYNO (WB4WOR)) writes:

> I don't understand why EVERYONE is fighting over this no-code under 30 Mhz.
> THERE IS NOW NO CODE OPERATIONS BELOW 30 MHZ! AND YOU DON'T NEED A LICENSE OF
> ANY KIND! You can run as MUCH POWER AS YOU WANT, USE ANY LANGUAGE YOU WANT,
> (foul too!) 95% of all HF rigs operate there NOW.
>

> Where is this panacea at you ask?
>
> Bewteen 26.9 to 27.4 (or there abouts. no one worries abt band linitis there)

Ten-Four, Good Buddy!

--Robert

Date: Sun, 17 Oct 1993 14:50:23 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Getting my license. Do I want to be like this?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <29k3p3\$8uj@cayman.Cayman.COM> northup@cayman.com (Bill Northup) writes:

>I should point out that for many - like myself - the first contact is here
>in rec.radio.amateur.....

>

>You should use some of this bandwidth to help teach new hams what you would
>like to see happen on the air, rather than debating code vs. no-code for
>months.

Ah, but debating code no-code, ordering pizza on the autopatch,
using radios on aircraft, etc is the reason the policy group was
created. For help on technical topics, operating tips, equipment,
and the like, try the other rec.radio.amateur.xx groups.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

Date: Sun, 17 Oct 1993 19:28:04 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!agate!spool.mu.edu!caen!nic.umass.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!
news.unomaha.edu!cwis!pschleck@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Getting my license. Do I want to be like this?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <29k3p3\$8uj@cayman.Cayman.COM> northup@cayman.com (Bill Northup) writes:

>I should point out that for many - like myself - the first contact is here
>in rec.radio.amateur.....

>You should use some of this bandwidth to help teach new hams what you would
>like to see happen on the air, rather than debating code vs. no-code for
>months.

Remember that this is a highly distributed forum, read by thousands of individuals, with probably as many different opinions. Even if every one of these people can be convinced not to debate anymore, there is still a steady stream of newcomers to light the flames again (ever hear of the term "September Surge?").

A pragmatic approach to this problem on the net is to create forums specially designed for endless debate. Sure, most of it is noise, but if you don't give it a place to go, it will find a home in YOUR nice friendly newsgroup. This includes the talk.* hierarchy, the *.advocacy groups in the comp.* hierarchy, and rec.radio.amateur.policy. Consider what it was like when all of this CW debate occurred in the main newsgroup (as it raged in rec.ham-radio throughout most of 1989 and 1990).

The bullies and loud-mouths will dominate Usenet only if we let them. Remember that you are only seeing a noisy and opinionated minority (if you follow any of these debates for a while, you'll notice it's usually the same handful of people, with few exceptions). Learn to ignore them, learn to recognize flame-bait when you see it, and don't let your buttons get pushed. Kill files are useful.

Check out Jay Maynard's "Guide to the Personal Radio Newsgroups," just recently posted, for an overview of the newsgroups and some netiquette tips. I'm sure you can find what you're looking for from our diverse selection of forums.

73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU

pschleck@unomaha.edu

Date: Sun, 17 Oct 1993 22:19:48 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: HF and MF access w/o the code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

A correction on my post concerning the 1650 meter band: feedline + antenna must not be longer than 50 feet; I hear that most folks do not use any feeline and just bring the rig to the antenna.

Now, I accessed the ham-server file concerning 1650m - two of the articles

state maximum 1 watt input and the other two articles state maximum 1 watt output; someone who has a copy of part 15 can clear this up.

QST has done some articles on this band - I'm going to go look them up in the library; I'll summarize my findings.

So there you have it; if you want to operate below 30 MHz but don't want to learn the code feel free to use 11 or 1650 meters. (but most of the comms on 1650 use CW...).

Jeff NH6IL (back in the days when we had everything below
200 meters <that's a lie! I'm only 39>: WA6QIJ)

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 93 02:10:09 CDT
From: usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: HF and MF access w/o the code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

> A correction on my post concerning the 1650 meter band: feedline + antenna
> must not be longer than 50 feet; I hear that most folks do not use any
> feeline and just bring the rig to the antenna.
>
> Now, I accessed the ham-server file concerning 1650m - two of the articles
> state maximum 1 watt input and the other two articles state maximum 1 watt
> output; someone who has a copy of part 15 can clear this up.
>
> QST has done some articles on this band - I'm going to go look them up in
> the library; I'll summarize my findings.
>
> So there you have it; if you want to operate below 30 MHz but don't want
> to learn the code feel free to use 11 or 1650 meters. (but most of the
> comms on 1650 use CW...).

I think you're talking about the 1750 meter band, aren't you (160-190kc)?

--Robert

Date: 17 Oct 1993 15:47:12 +0200
From: pipex!sunic!news.funet.fi!butler.cc.tut.fi!lehtori.cc.tut.fi!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Mods to Part 97?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Douglas J Renze (drenze@icaen.uiowa.edu) wrote:

> Question: I know that amateurs such as me and thee can propose modifications
> to part 97, but I was wondering how one goes about doing this.

> The modification I would like to see has to do with the license
> structure, to bring it in line with those of most other nations.

I don't know what nations you are refering to, but in here Europe,
we are trying to create a more or less standard licence structure:

CEPT I/HAREC A Licence refers to full privileges on all bands

CEPT II/HAREC B Licence refers to full privileges on all
bands above 30 MHz.

A holder of a CEPT-licence can temporary (up to 3 months) operate
portable or mobile in any other CEPT-licence country without any
paper work. The CEPT-licence is widely accepted in Europe and in some
other countries like New Zealand.

The HAREC system is about getting a permanent national licence in
a country without testing, if you have a HAREC compatible licence
from some other country. Currently only a few countries accept the
HAREC system, but many countries are working on their regulations,
in order to be able to accept it.

There are of course a lot of restricted (novice) licence classes in
various European countries, but as far as I know, there hasn't been
any attempts to harmonize them.

I hope that your proposal would somehow reflect this structure and
if you get it through, the U.S. might some day be able to sign at
least the CEPT-licence agreement. Then it would be much easier for
hams to travel across the Pond, without worrying about reciprocal
licences etc.

Paul OH3LWR

Phone : +358-31-213 3657

X.400 : G=Paul S=Keinanen O=Elisa-Tampere A=ELISA C=FI

Internet: Paul.Keinanen@Telebox.tele.fi

Telex : 58-100 1825 (ATTN: Keinanen Paul)
Mail : Hameenpuisto 42 A 26
FIN-33200 TAMPERE
FINLAND

Date: Sun, 17 Oct 1993 15:02:57 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Mods to Part 97?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Oct16.230324.14433@news.uiowa.edu> drenze@icaen.uiowa.edu (Douglas J Renze) writes:

>Question: I know that amateurs such as me and thee can propose modifications
>to part 97, but I was wondering how one goes about doing this.

>

> The modification I would like to see has to do with the license
>structure, to bring it in line with those of most other nations. That is,
>I would like to propose the following license structure:

>

>NOVICE: Same as the current novice license privileges. 5 WPM code requirement.

>COMMUNICATOR: same as the current no-code Tech license.

>

>TECHNICIAN: Same as, or perhaps slightly greater privs than the current

> Tech/HF license. Upgrade path for both Novice and Communicator.

>GENERAL: Same privs as the current Amateur Extra class, with the 13WPM

> requirement.

>

>Obviously, this is only a rough sketch of my proposal. Ideas? Anybody out

>there in net-land interested in helping me hammer this out? Please--if you

>think I'm a bloody loon, tell me, but no flames.

Well the FCC doesn't like new classes, their antique computer barfs.

Let's try this instead.

NOVICE: Same as now.

TECH: Same as now. If you want limited HF, you can concurrently hold
NOVICE and TECH. (Same as now, really, that's what TECH+ amounts to)

GENERAL: All privldges. Current Extra Theory requirement, 13 WPM
Morse exam.

Now, one more change that applies to *all* classes. Passing score will
be determined by scoring 70% correct on the *sum* of all questions in
all elements required for the class attempted. No more CSCE credits,
you have to pass all the elements for a given license class at a sitting.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

Date: 17 Oct 1993 21:00:24 -0400

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!news.delphi.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <19930ct17.021814.26596@anomaly.sbs.com>, <29qstj\$rf4@news.delphi.com>, <CF21JG.JLz@world.std.com>-mail

Subject : Re: End-It All Now, Please...

You still haven't cited a valid reason for REQUIRING Morse Code.

Date: 17 Oct 1993 20:59:28 -0400

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!news.delphi.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <19930ct16.225746.14317@news.uiowa.edu>, <29qsqp\$rd6@news.delphi.com>, <CF1wyz.EJ1@news.Hawaii.Edu>

Subject : Re: End-It All Now, Please...

jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>But there already is a no-code HF band available and one does not even
>need a license to operate (and one has 3 modes to choose from: AM, SSB,
>and the unmodulated carrier): 11 meters.

>But for a real challenge, try the 1650 meter band; again no license is
>needed. There is a strict limitation to power output (one watt or less?)
>and antenna + feedline length must be under something like 10 feet. I'll
>look it up and repost. You can build your own equipment. You can work DX.

>So there you have it - two low-band options for those not willing to
>learn the code.

Two low-band options, NEITHER of which have anything to do with Amateur Radio.

Do you have a REAL justification -- not the ITU treaty (which we CAN opt out of by notification as Japan did), not keeping out the riff-raff (which are NOT being kept out now), and not the false issue of "if I did it, you should have to" -- for denying HF access to those who don't know the Morse Code, for whatever reason?

Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Date: Sun, 17 Oct 1993 17:08:59 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Oct16.154841.28001@gsm001.mendelson.com>,
<1993Oct16.225746.14317@news.uiowa.edu>, <29qsqp\$rd6@news.delphi.com>
Subject : Re: End-It All Now, Please...

In article <29qsqp\$rd6@news.delphi.com> edellers@news.delphi.com
(EDELLERS@DELPHI.COM) writes:

>"Don't take away my hf tho!"

>

>A no-code HF license would have NO effect on the present CW subbands at
>all. Even if we DID get a major influx of digital users in the subbands,
>the answer would be to split the subbands (the way the phone bands used to
>be split with regard to SSTV), not thriow up a roadblock to new hams.

But there already is a no-code HF band available and one does not even
need a license to operate (and one has 3 modes to choose from: AM, SSB,
and the unmodulated carrier): 11 meters.

But for a real challenge, try the 1650 meter band; again no license is
needed. There is a strict limitation to power output (one watt or less?)
and antenna + feedline length must be under something like 10 feet. I'll
look it up and repost. You can build your own equipment. You can work DX.

So there you have it - two low-band options for those not willing to
learn the code.

Jeff NH6IL

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #380
